



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

which is spread for you to day. To His table you are now invited. He not only calls on you with heart and mind to ascend to Him : He offers to dwell with you. It is true we do not believe that when He departed from us, it was only the sensible appearance of His body which was removed, or that now He mocks our senses by unsubstantial and delusive appearances. All that concerns us to know is, that we have the covenanted certainty of His union with the faithful communicant; that through this sacred ordinance He imparts Himself entire to us, and incorporates us with Him & His mystical members, and that "what merit, force, or virtue soever there is in His sacrificed body and blood we have it fully by this sacrament;" that through it our human nature is purified by union with His, our sinful bodies made clean by His body, our souls washed by His precious blood; we are enabled evermore to dwell in Him and He in us. May He give us hearts to desire these His precious promises. May He enable us to draw near unto Him with faith, and by faith find the fulfilment of them. May He, having enabled us to know Him here by faith, grant us the fruition of His glorious Godhead hereafter.—Amen.

## ANCIENT LITURGIES—NO. III.

## THE LITURGY OF ST. CHRYSOSTOM.

It is not our intention to give the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom at any length. It is admitted that the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom was, in substance, the Liturgy of St. Basil, adopted in the Church of Constantinople by St. Chrysostom, about thirty years after the time of St. Basil, that is, about the year 400. St. Chrysostom may probably have made some lesser modifications in it, but the substance was the same. But when Constantinople became the first Patriarchate of the east, the Churches which adopted her Liturgy spoke of it as St. Chrysostom's rather than St. Basil's. We need not, therefore, go over the same ground again in considering what was in fact the same Liturgy under another name.

But the mention of St. Chrysostom's Liturgy leads us to the proof of a fact which we rather assumed when speaking of St. Basil's Liturgy, and which we have now to prove.

We then assumed and asserted that the word *Θεοτόκος* (*Theotokos*), which occurs three times in the modern copies of St. Chrysostom's communion service, and twice in the modern Greek copies of St. Basil's, did not once occur in the original communion service of St. Basil or St. Chrysostom.

It will appear from an article in our present number that we do not make this assertion out of any dislike to what the word "*Theotokos*" was originally intended to express. We here point out this fact simply as a proof to what an extent the modern copies of those Liturgies have been interpolated, and as a means of detecting interpolated passages.

The original documents connected with the Nestorian controversy afford conclusive evidence that in the year 431, when the Council of Ephesus was held, the word *Theotokos* did not occur in the Liturgy of the Church of Constantinople. That was not 30 years after the time of St. Chrysostom. And as no charge was ever made against Nestorius, the heretical Archbishop of Constantinople in that year, of having put this word out of the Liturgy of his Church, we conclude that the word *Theotokos* was not in that Liturgy in St. Chrysostom's time. And that leads us to the further conclusion that the word was not in the Liturgy of St. Basil, for St. Chrysostom in adopting that Liturgy would probably not have omitted the word if he had found it there.

We will now produce the documents on which this argument is founded, taken from the history and proceedings of the Council of Ephesus, in the *Concilium Generalia* of Labbe and Cossart, vol. iii, p. 10, &c. (Ed. Paris, 1671.)

The sermon of Proclus<sup>a</sup> was preached in the Church of Constantinople, in the presence of Nestorius, in vindication of the title "*Theotokos*," which Nestorius denied to be applicable to the Blessed Virgin. This sermon nowhere appeals to the fact that this term was, or had ever been, applied to the Blessed Virgin in the Liturgy of that very Church of Constantinople. The preacher, of course, would have used such an argument if he could. The fact that he did not use it is conclusive that the word "*Theotokos*" was not then applied to the blessed Virgin in the Liturgy of the Church of Constantinople.

But Proclus, urging as he did the applicability of the term, was careful to mark its true force and limitation:—"We do not preach a man deified, but we confess God incarnate, who inscribed His own handmaiden as His mother—He, who according to His being was *without mother*, and according to the dispensation on earth, *without father*."<sup>b</sup>

In the book which St. Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria, wrote to the empresses on this question, he undertakes to show that older fathers called the Virgin "*Theotokos*." He quotes Athanasius as calling her so; he quotes Atticus, who was Bishop of Constantinople not long after the time of Chrysostom, but who did not call the Virgin

"*Theotokos*," but only maintains that "the Word was made flesh."

He quotes the Bishop of Antioch, who calls her "*Theotokos*," also Amphilochius, of Iconium, who does not call her "*Theotokos*," but says that he who was born was God; also, Ammon, Bishop of Adrianople, who calls her "*Theotokos*."

St. Cyril then quotes from St. Chrysostom a passage which affirms that the Son is God, but does not call the Virgin "*Theotokos*." Now, considering that the question arose in that very Church in which the name of Chrysostom was so great, and the Liturgy of which Chrysostom had himself settled, St. Cyril would surely have quoted the word "*Theotokos*" from that liturgy if the word had been in it.

Again, in the epistle which St. Cyril wrote to Nestorius, who, as we have said, was Bishop of Constantinople, to persuade him to use the word "*Theotokos*," he does not appeal to the fact that the word was in the public Liturgy of Nestorius's own Church, which assuredly St. Cyril would have noticed if the fact were so.<sup>c</sup>

In his second letter to Nestorius, in which St. Cyril appeals to the Fathers for the use of the word, he is equally silent as to the Liturgy of Constantinople.<sup>d</sup>

In another letter<sup>e</sup> St. Cyril complains that in the Church of Constantinople itself, Dorotheus, in presence of Nestorius, had pronounced anathema on any one who used the word *Θεοτόκος*, and that, notwithstanding, Nestorius had admitted him then and there to the communion. St. Cyril again appeals to the fact that the Fathers used the word. It surely would have been to the point to say, if it could have been said, that the word was in that very communion service which Nestorius and Dorotheus were then celebrating.

Again, in the letter which St. Cyril wrote to the clergy of Constantinople in support of the word *Theotokos*, he is still silent as to that word being in their own Liturgy.<sup>f</sup>

In the letter of St. Cyril to Celestine, Bishop of Rome,<sup>g</sup> about the aforesaid sermon of Dorotheus, there is the same appeal to the Fathers for the use of the word *Theotokos*, and the same silence as to the Liturgy of Constantinople.

The letters of Celestine to Nestorius and the clergy of Constantinople are equally silent upon the word being in their Liturgy.<sup>h</sup>

The complaint of the clergy of Constantinople to the Emperor<sup>i</sup> against Nestorius for his proceedings against those who used the word *Theotokos*, does not justify them by appealing to the fact that the word was in the Liturgy of their Church.

A number of other documents might be produced in which we might well expect to find some reference to the word *Theotokos*, if it had been in the Liturgy of Constantinople at that time; yet no document ever alludes to that word being there. We are, therefore, warranted in concluding that there was no such word in that Liturgy at that time.

If Nestorius had struck that word out of the Liturgy, which he surely would have done if it had been there, we should, no doubt, have heard that fact alleged against him again and again. Yet he is never accused of having done so, and therefore we conclude that the word *Θεοτόκος* was not in the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom; and if not in his, it was not in the Liturgy of St. Basil.

We will now proceed to notice the three passages of the modern copy of St. Chrysostom's communion service (from the dismissal of the catechumens to the end), in which the word *Theotokos* is found; that our readers may see what sort of passages bear on the face of them this mark of being interpolated; and it will also be seen that in each case there is other and independent evidence that those passages are really interpolations.

I. "Celebrating the memory of our all holy, undefiled, blessed-above-all, and glorious Lady *Theotokos*, the ever Virgin Mary, with all the saints, we commend ourselves and each other, and all our life, to Christ the God." (Goor, *Rituale Graecorum*, p. 74. Ed. Paris, 1647.)

This passage is not in the Barberini M.S., which is the *oldest* Greek copy of St. Chrysostom's Liturgy (p. 99). This shows the passage to have been added *after* the tenth century.

The passage also occurs *before* that part of the modern "Liturgy of St. Chrysostom" which corresponds with the genuine commencement of St. Basil's Liturgy, as ascertained in our last.

Thus the word *Theotokos* in this passage corresponds with other proofs of interpolation.

II. Again, in GEAR, p. 18, we find in the *modern* Liturgy, called St. Chrysostom's, the following passage:—"We further offer to Thee this reasonable service, for those who have rested in the faith, for those before the fathers, for the fathers, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, preachers, evangelists, martyrs, the continent, and every spirit made perfect in faith; especially for our all-holy, undefiled, blessed-above-all, and glorious Lady *Theotokos*, and ever Virgin Mary."

We have shown in our last that there was no such passage in the original and genuine Liturgy of St. Basil, which Chrysostom adopted and followed. Here too, therefore, the word *Theotokos* concurs with other evidences of interpolation.

III. Again, at p. 84:—"Direct our way, confirm us in thy fear, guard our life, preserve our steps, at the prayers and intercession of the glorious *Theotokos*, and ever Virgin Mary, and all the saints."

We have shown in our last that a similar passage was introduced in the Liturgy of St. Basil *after* the Syriac translation of that Liturgy was made, being found only in the Syriac copy. We may, therefore, be certain that this passage was not in the genuine Liturgy of St. Chrysostom. So here, too, the word *Theotokos* concurs with other evidence of interpolation.

Thus, in all the places where the term *Theotokos* is now found in the modern so-called Liturgy of St. Chrysostom (from the dismissal of the catechumens to the end), we have other independent proof that those passages are interpolations. That independent proof is strikingly confirmed by the evidence of the documents we have referred to, relating to the Nestorian controversy, which show that the word *Theotokos* was not in the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom in the year 431.

Thus it ever is; when the evidence is closely examined, whatever goes direct to magnify God the Son—whatever goes direct to prove that God the Son was made man—that He who was born of the Blessed Virgin was both God and man: *all that* can be traced up to the preaching of the Apostles themselves. But whatever goes to magnify Mary as an intercessor—a saviour, the proof of *that* always stops short in the inventions and interpolations of late and corrupted ages.

We think our examination of ancient Liturgies has not been in vain, if it has done no more than lead us to this result.

We have been unwilling to fatigue our readers with the multitude of instances we might produce of the manner in which the ancient Liturgies have been corrupted in later times, but we may hereafter return to the subject, in order to examine briefly the *ROMAN LITURGY*.

## Θεοτόκος, DEIPARA, MOTHER OF GOD.

We wish to know, once for all, and to have it settled in our readers' minds, whether Roman Catholics are right or wrong in styling the Blessed Virgin, "Mother of God."

We cordially confess and fully believe that He whom she bore is "God of the substance of the Father, begotten before the world, and man of the substance of His mother, born in the world;" and in that faith we hope to die, and to meet Him at His coming. But the question is, if this be not enough; or if it be necessary for true Catholics further to give to HER that service and duty and obedience which some Roman Catholics tell us that God Himself must owe and render to His own Mother.

The question is not at all concerning *Him*, her Son; it is concerning *her* only, whether SHE, as mother of God, is a joint partaker of the worship and service which we owe to God.

This question is becoming daily more and more the turning point and distinguishing characteristic of opposite religious systems, and we are resolved, once for all, to try to settle our own minds and those of our readers concerning it.

The only argument we have ever heard for calling the Virgin "Mother of God" is this:—that the General Council of Ephesus, acknowledged as a "general council" by the Church of England and Ireland, and by Protestants generally, decreed that all Christians should call the Blessed Virgin "Mother of God," and should give to her all that was due to her in that capacity; and that, therefore, all who acknowledge "the first four general councils," as we do, have the same authority for this as for the articles of the faith contained in the Nicene creed.

The CATHOLIC LAYMAN was established to test such assertions by original authorities. In this way we will deal with the question; and we invite the attention of all who, like ourselves, are in earnest in seeking for truth and knowledge in those things which lie at the root of their religion.

We approach this subject without passion or prejudice. Many of the Greek Fathers called the Blessed Virgin Θεοτόκος; many of the Latin Fathers called her "Deipara." We have no dislike to either of these terms, save that they are sought to be perverted, and we should be quite willing to use either or both of them in the same sense in which the Greek and Latin Fathers in old times used them.

But, after carefully examining the facts and the evidence, we affirm—

I. That "Mother of God" is not the true or proper English translation of Θεοτόκος or "Deipara."

II. That though individual bishops may have used the word at and before the Council of Ephesus, that general

<sup>a</sup> Our readers will not suppose that we are here admitting that even a general council is infallible. On the contrary, we strictly hold to the 21st article of the Church of England, which, treating of the authority of general councils, says—"Forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all are not governed with the Spirit and Word of God, they may err, and sometimes have err'd, even in things pertaining unto God. Whereupon things ordained by them as necessary to salvation have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they have been taken out of Holy Scripture." But we find that the faith defined by those four Councils is no other than the faith of Holy Scripture; and we take this as proof that the Church of Christ is founded on the Rock of faith and that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against her."

<sup>b</sup> Cap. vi, p. 313.

<sup>c</sup> Cap. vii, p. 316-321.

<sup>d</sup> Cap. x, p. 324.

<sup>e</sup> Cap. xii, p. 332.

<sup>f</sup> Cap. xviii, p. 353.

<sup>g</sup> Cap. xii, p. 361.

<sup>h</sup> Cap. xxx. 426.

council did not adopt the word Θεοτόκος ('Theotokos'), nor decree that the Blessed Virgin should be called Θεοτόκος.

I. We affirm that "Mother of God" is not the true translation of the Greek Θεοτόκος or of the Latin "Deipara."

If the Greek Fathers had intended to express what is now intended by "Mother of God," they would obviously have used the words Θεού μητήρ, which are the true and proper Greek for "Mother of God;" and the Latin Fathers would as obviously have used the words "Dei Mater."

But the Greek Fathers did not call her Θεού μητήρ. Sooner than call her so, they invented a new Greek word, Θεοτόκος, which word was never heard of before. Sooner than call her "Dei Mater," the Latin Fathers invented a new Latin word, "Deipara." The fact of their inventing new words shows that they considered the existing words of their language unsuitable to express their meaning. The fact is a striking one, that both Greek and Latin Fathers shrank from applying to the Blessed Virgin those terms of their languages which would literally express "Mother of God."

But the Greek Fathers called her Θεοτόκος, and the Latin Fathers called her "Deipara." True, many of them did so, and so perhaps might we in the sense in which they used it. But as they refused to call her Θεού μητήρ, and "Dei Mater," so we, FOLLOWING THEIR EXAMPLES, refuse to call her "Mother of God."

We will now show how the new words which the Fathers thought it necessary to invent, did differ in sense and meaning from the words which they refused to use.

Μητήρ, in the Greek language, "Mater" in the Latin, and "Mother" in English—all express *more than one* simple idea or relation.

All three words express the fact that the mother brought forth the child.

All three words further express the relation which thence arises, and afterwards continues to exist, between the mother and the child, viz., authority and right in the mother, duty and obedience in the child.

For this reason the Fathers would never use Μητῆρ (Mother), in connection with Θεός (God), or "Mater" (Mother), in connection with "Deus" (God). They searched carefully for words that would express *only* the fact of God being made of a woman, *without* expressing any maternal authority of the woman in respect of God.

For this purpose some of the Greek Fathers invented the word Θεοτόκος, compounded of Θεός (God), and τεκτόν (bring forth). The Latin translated this literally by "Deipara," compounded of "Deus" (God), and "pario," to (bring forth). The Latins sometimes paraphrased this by "Genetrix Dei," which has exactly the same meaning, the word *genetrix* being derived from the old Latin verb, "geno, genere," to bring forth.

All these words express only the fact that *He whom the Virgin brought forth was truly God*. The words express the divine nature of Him who was born of the Virgin; but at the same time the words are carefully weighed, to avoid expressing any maternal authority or right in the Virgin, in relation to God.

But modern Roman Catholics insist on translating Θεοτόκος and "Deipara" "Mother of God," for the very purpose of introducing those maternal relations of authority and right over Him who is God, which the words of the Fathers were carefully intended to exclude. Roman Catholics insist on translating as if the Greek Fathers had used the words Μητῆρ Θεού, which they avoided to use; as if the Latin Fathers had used the words "Mater Dei," which they avoided to use.

We say that this is false translation, intended to support false views of religion.

II. We affirm that the General Council of Ephesus did not adopt the word Θεοτόκος, or decree that Christians should call the Blessed Virgin Θεοτόκος.

It must be plain to our readers from what we have already said, that we do not make this assertion out of any dislike to what is properly expressed in the word Θεοτόκος. We make the assertion simply as a matter of fact.

At the same time, we do believe it to be an instance of God's Providential care and government over His Church, that He did not permit an admittedly general council of the Church to adopt a term which, however unobjectionable in itself, has since been so perverted by false translation.

We will now give a brief statement of what the General Council of Ephesus actually did, in the matter of Nestorius, the Archbishop of Constantinople, who maintained that Jesus, who was born of the Virgin, was a *different person* from "God the Son," and, *therefore*, denied that the Virgin could be called Θεοτόκος.

We have not met the term Θεού μητῆρ in any Greek Father, or "Dei Mater" in any Latin Father. If such words should be found in a few writers, this would be of no weight against the general consent of the Fathers. We cannot consider St. Vincent of Lerins an exception, for when he gives his own opinion he always uses the word "Theotokos;" he uses "Dei Mater" only when reporting the objections of the Nestorians (Common. c. xv.), who, of course, tried to express the doctrine of the Church in words that Catholics would feel to be objectionable. We have seen the expression "Dei Mater" in a synodical letter of Theodore of Jerusalem, which was read in the third act of the second Council of Nice (Labbe and Coss., vol. vii., p. 722). We think this of no value, because Theodore wrote in Greek, and we have not the Greek he wrote, but only a barbarous Latin translation, made probably some ages later. This is not proof that Theodore used the words Θεού μητῆρ; and even if he did, this Theodore, who lived probably about the year 730, is too late to have much weight in this question.

We take this account from the "Concilia Generalia" of Labbe and Cossart, vol. iii., p. 453 to 574 (Ed. Paris, 1671).

In the first place Nestorius was cited three times, according to the canons, to appear in the Synod (p. 453-460); and he refusing to appear, the Synod proceeded to examine the cause.

The creed of the Synod of Nice was then read, as being that by which the question was to be decided.

The letter of Cyril, Archbishop of Alexandria, to Nestorius was then read.<sup>4</sup> In this letter, St. Cyril proves, through the length of two folio columns, that the Divinity and the Humanity, joined in one person, were ONE Christ and Son. At the close of his letter, having fully proved this, St. Cyril says—"We find that the holy Fathers thus thought; thus they were bold to call the Holy Virgin Θεοτόκος; not as if the nature of the Word, or His Divinity, had taken the commencement of his Being from the Holy Virgin, but as His sacred body, endowed with a rational soul, was born of her."<sup>5</sup> This is all St. Cyril's letter says on that point. He mentions the fact that some Fathers called her Θεοτόκος, but does not assert that it is necessary to use that word. The whole object of the letter is to prove that Jesus Christ, who was born of her according to the flesh, was truly God.

St. Cyril then asked to have it decided whether what he had written was agreeable to the creed of the Council of Nice.

On that question, each bishop expressed his opinion in his own words. The words used by 126 bishops are given,<sup>6</sup> ending with, "and all the other bishops laid down the same things."

All of them approved of the doctrine of St. Cyril's letter, as being agreeable to the creed of the Council of Nice.

Of the 126 bishops whose speeches are recorded, ONE, Helanicus of Rhodes, concluded his speech thus: "Anathema be to him who does not believe the Holy Virgin to be Θεοτόκος."

This bishop spoke early in the debate; he was the ninth who spoke.<sup>7</sup> The Council, therefore, had this view of the case plainly put before them.

Of the other 125 bishops whose words are recorded, *not one* uttered the word Θεοτόκος out of his lips!! So little notion had the Fathers at Ephesus that the object of their assembling was to establish the use of the word Θεοτόκος!

There is but one way of accounting for this striking fact: it is this, the Fathers at Ephesus felt that the solemn duty they had to perform was to decide a question about our faith as to the person and nature of Christ, *not* about the honour or dignity of the Virgin.

It was then proposed by Palladius, Bishop of Amasea, that the letter of Nestorius should be read, in order to see if it were agreeable to the doctrine of the Fathers of Nice.<sup>8</sup>

That letter, in which Nestorius makes out the Son of God and the Son of the Virgin to be two *different persons*, was then read.

The bishops present then declared their opinions, whether this letter were "agreeable to the faith defined in the holy synod of the holy Fathers assembled at Nice," which all decided in the negative.

The opinions of 33 of the bishops are given at length in their own words.<sup>9</sup> Helanicus of Rhodes, who spoke the sixth, concluded his speech as before, "I profess the Holy Virgin Mary Θεοτόκος, and anathema be to him who does not so believe."

One other bishop, Prothymius of Comana, who spoke the twelfth, said, "I anathematise every one who does not call the Blessed Virgin Θεοτόκος."

The other 31 bishops, whose speeches are recorded, did not mention the word Θεοτόκος.

The opinions of all the other bishops, besides those 33, are summed up in saying that, here all the bishops cried out anathema to Nestorius, and his impious faith, and to all who communicate with him;<sup>10</sup> but not one word appears of anathema to those who would not use the word Θεοτόκος; so little notion had the Fathers of Ephesus still that the great business of their council was to establish the use of the word Θεοτόκος!

The letter of Cælestine, Bishop of Rome, to Nestorius, concerning his errors, was then read;<sup>11</sup> the word Θεοτόκος does not occur in that letter!

The letter of Cyril and the Synod of Egypt, which had been previously held at Alexandria, to Nestorius, was then read, at the request of Peter, a Presbyter of Alexandria, who was present in the Council at Ephesus.

That letter of Cyril and the Synod of Egypt did pronounce anathema on whoever did not confess the Holy Virgin Θεοτόκος.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>4</sup> P. 461. This letter itself is given p. 316, cap. viii.

<sup>5</sup> Οὐτως εὐρίσομεν τοὺς ἀγίους περισσηκάτας πατέρας. οὐτως τεθαρσήσας Θεοτόκου εἰπεῖν τὴν ἀγίαν παρθίνου· οὐχ ὡς τῆς τὸν λόγου φύσωσε, ἀλλος τῆς θεότητος αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ τίναι λαβούσης ἐκ τῆς ἀγίας παρθένου, ἀλλ' ὡς γενηθεντος ἐξ ἀντῆς τὸν ἀγίου σώματος, ψυχωθέντος τε λογικῶς.—P. 322.

<sup>6</sup> P. 461-492.

<sup>7</sup> P. 492. This letter is given, p. 321, cap. ix.

<sup>8</sup> P. 493 to 501.

<sup>9</sup> P. 495.

<sup>10</sup> P. 501.

<sup>11</sup> P. 501. The letter itself is given, p. 352.

<sup>12</sup> P. 501. The letter itself is given at p. 408.

The General Council of Ephesus heard this read, and by not confirming that anathema, virtually by their silence set aside what the inferior Provincial Synod had done.<sup>13</sup>

Proof was then produced that copies of the above documents had been given to Nestorius.<sup>14</sup>

And proof of the false doctrine of Nestorius was then given, in which mention was made only of his error respecting the person and nature of Christ, and not one word was said about his refusing due honour to the Blessed Virgin,<sup>15</sup> nor is the word Θεοτόκος mentioned. The doctrine charged on him was this: that "he had asserted that there was *one* Son who had been subject to death, and *another* Son who was God the Word."<sup>16</sup>

Testimonies from earlier fathers and bishops were then read<sup>17</sup> as bearing on the question of doctrine; 18 passages were produced from Athanasius, Basil, Amphilochius, &c. Two of those passages have the word Θεοτόκος. In one of them, possibly it is not genuine. Sixteen of those passages have not the word Θεοτόκος! So little notion had the bishops who selected those passages that the great business of that Council was to establish the use of the word Θεοτόκος!

Then were read passages from the writings of Nestorius,<sup>18</sup> in which it is clear that the one thing looked at was his doctrine concerning Christ, whether He who was born into the world was truly God or only Man.

Then was read the letter of Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage,<sup>19</sup> which letter St. Vincent of Lerins has made famous in connection with this subject; and in this letter the word Θεοτόκος does not appear.

Sentence of deprivation was then passed on Nestorius as having refused to appear on their citation to answer to the charges; the sentence proceeding both on his false doctrine and his contumacy. In this sentence, the word Θεοτόκος does not appear.

When Cyril writes to the clergy at Constantinople, after the sentence, to tell them what was done, he *then says* nothing of *Theotokos*, but relates that Nestorius was deprived "because he had openly said, that Jesus was not God." (Page 563.)

When the Council related their proceedings to the Emperor, they gave this reason only for depriving Nestorius, "that he had not ceased to say that we should not call Him God, who, for our sakes, was made man." But about the Virgin, or Theotokos, they said nothing. (Page 571.)

In all these proceedings the Synod was careful to maintain the true faith concerning Christ, both God and Man. But the Synod never thought fit to go into any consideration of whether the word Θεοτόκος ought to be used or not. In fact, the Synod never itself used the word Θεοτόκος but once, and then only as the name of a Church in Ephesus!<sup>20</sup>

We call attention now to the importance of this question. Just as it is of the very essence of our religion to hold that He who was born of the Virgin is truly God, so it is of the essence of the modern religion of Rome to hold that the Blessed Virgin is "Mother of God;" and for that they rely chiefly on this General Council of Ephesus.

We have seen that this Council did not decree that the Blessed Virgin should be called Θεοτόκος.

We have seen that the Greek Fathers durst not call the Blessed Virgin Θεού Μητῆρ (Mother of God): that the Latin Fathers durst not call her "Dei Mater" (Mother of God).

Once for all, then, we demand that some reason be shown, if reason there be, why we should call her "Mother of God" in English.

We address this to the priests of Ireland, numbers of whom we have good reason to believe read the CATHOLIC LAYMAN; and all of whom have easy access to it. Let them now produce their proofs from the early Church, that the Blessed Virgin is to be called "Mother of God;" and our pages are at their service to publish it.

If they have no such proof, let them cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord, by asserting what they cannot prove; and let all who seek for the true faith of Christ beware of being so perverted.

<sup>13</sup> It was probably this epistle of Cyril and the Synod of Egypt which led to the prevailing opinion that the Council of Ephesus did pronounce anathema against all who did not use the word Θεοτόκος. Dionysius Exiguus, who wrote about the year 530, gave this letter truly as from the Synod of Egypt; but Isidore Mercator, the notorious forger, about the year 780, represented this letter as part of the proceedings of the General Council of Ephesus. Merlin, Crabbé, and other editors of the council followed Isidore Mercator in this. Thus the false notion was spread about the Council of Ephesus. Laurentius Surius, Justilius, and Labbe, all pointed out that this letter was no part of the proceedings of the Council of Ephesus. Yet, the false notion that it led to about that council is not yet sufficiently corrected. See "Observatio Philippi Labbe, Con. Gen. vol. iii., p. 409.

<sup>14</sup> P. 54.

<sup>15</sup> P. 5'5 (misprinted 497).

<sup>16</sup> ἀλλον μὲν ἐφ είναι τὸν υἱὸν τὸν τὸ πάθος ἀναδεξάμενον, ἀλλον δὲ τὸν Θεὸν λόγος.—P. 505 (misprinted 498).

<sup>17</sup> P. 508 to 518.

<sup>18</sup> P. 520.

<sup>19</sup> P. 529.

<sup>20</sup> P. 533. The proceedings and sentence against Nestorius were objected to as irregular by the Nestorian party. But in the third Act of the Council of Ephesus, those proceedings were confirmed, and subscribed by the legates of Cælestine, Bishop of Rome.

<sup>21</sup> "Synical Epistle, p. 574. The text of this Synical Epistle is evidently and confessedly defective. The next letter which follows, from Cyril to the Church at Alexandria, makes it evident that the reference is to a Church at Ephesus which was called Θεοτόκος."